

purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation.

Adulteration of the 5 boxes of Methylene Blue Compound and 56 boxes of Salol Compound was alleged for the reason that their strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which they were sold.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged for the reason that the statements, to wit, “\* \* \* Capsules (Copaiba) 10 Min.,” “\* \* \* Capsules Methylene Blue Compound \* \* \* Oil Santal 1½ Min., Copaiba Para 1½ Min., Oil Cinnamon 1½ Min., Methylene Blue 1 Gr., and “\* \* \* Capsules Salol Compound, Balsam Copaiba 10 min., Oleoresin Cubeb 5 min., Salol 3½ gr., Pepsin Aseptic (1:3000) 1 gr.,” were false and misleading in that they represented that a portion of the capsules consisted of copaiba, whereas examination of samples of the article showed that it consisted of copaiba and approximately 50 per cent cottonseed oil; and for the further reason that the statements represented that a portion of the capsules consisted of methylene blue compound, whereas examination of samples showed that the product consisted of small amounts of resins from copaiba and, other oils, of methylene blue and approximately 50 per cent of cottonseed oil; and for the further reason that the statement represented that the remaining portion of the capsules consisted of salol compound, whereas examination of samples showed that the product consisted of copaiba, cubebs, salol, and pepsin, and from 50 to 60 per cent cottonseed oil; and for the further reason that it was an imitation of, and was offered for sale under the name of, another article.

Misbranding of the capsules of Balsam Copaiba and Methylene Blue Compound was alleged for the reason that the statements regarding the contents were false and misleading in that there was a shortage in volume, ranging from 13.2 to 23.2 per cent and 25.3 to 28.7 per cent, respectively, in representative series of individual capsules.

On June 30, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the property should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**7178. Adulteration of oranges. U. S. \* \* \* v. 462 Boxes of Oranges. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 9943. I. S. Nos. 13423-r, 13424-r. S. No. E-1275.)**

On March 22, 1919, the United States attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 462 boxes of oranges, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Pittsburgh, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 8, 1919, by the Sparr Fruit Co., La Manda Park, Cal., and transported from the State of California into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed vegetable substance.

On April 19, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product should be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*